During the review of cost audit report, it was noticed that in most of the above cases the company's imported raw materials/intermediates were far in excess to their requirement. Thus the benefit received by the company in the form of duty draw back and cash compensatory support was much more than the entitlement. As per available information these cases were referred to Deptt. of Revenue by the Department of Company Affairs for further necessary action.

Instance of overcharging on drugs

1943. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1153 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 5th March, 1992 and state:

(a) when each instance of overcharging came to the notice of his ministry and why even after many years no action has been taken in those cases;

(b) whether any officer has been allowed to overstay his tenure due to proximity to the producers, if so, the period for which of Technical officer, Project Officer, Assistant Development Commissioner etc. were extended;

(c) whether it is a fact that these technical officers play to the tune of their senior bureaucrats and due to this they have been regarded with promotions etc; and

(d) what are the details of prices of scheduled drugs notified from June, 1991 and what were their earlier prices and what is the percentage of price increase?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) As stated in answer to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1153 answered on 5th March, 1992, all the cases are still under examination.

(b) and (c) There are no such instances.

(d) The details of prices of scheduled drugs notified from June, 1991 with their earlier prices and percentage increase|decrease are given in the annexure. [*See Appendix CLXIII, Annexure No.* 63].

Overcharging the price of certain drugs

1944. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA:
SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 418 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 27th February, 1992 and state:

(a) whether cases of overcharging of price of Chloramphenicol by a number of companies overcharging of price of Dextropropaxyphene overcharging of Price of Penicillin by HAL and overcharging of price of Ephedrine where notices have been issued were not within the notice of his Ministry;

(b) since when they escaped notice and on what consideration;

(c) what are the reasons for which his Ministry did not take notice of overcharging of price of Ampicillin Sodium Sterile and Erythromycin by Mehta Pharmaceuticals;

(d) whether details of formulations for which prices have been overcharged are systematically missing; and

(a) what are the complete details of the cases that have come to the notice of Government during 1992 till date?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) and (b) This Department received some complaints regarding overcharging of prices of Chloramphenicol Powder by some manufacturers in the small scale sector producing from L-base (an imported intermediate). The case of overcharging the price of Dextropropoxyphene also came to the notice of this Department. The relevant details|data is being collected from the manufacturers who overcharged the prices fixed by the Government.

Only after getting the complete dam details the cases of overcharging of Chloramphenicol Powder and Dextropropoxyphene would be established. The cases of overcharging of Pencillin G by M|s HAL also came to the notice of this Department but M|s. HAL clarified that they supplied Penicillin C Ist Crystals of IP trade. The case of overcharging in respect of Ephederine has been established and the same was listed in the Annexure to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 418 answered on 27-2-1992.

(c) There is no information regarding overcharging of the price of Ampicillin Sodium Sterile and Erythrmycin by M|s. Mehta Pharmaceuticals.

(d) The cases of overcharging of formulations, in which overcharging has been established were listed in the Annexure to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Qucstion No 418 answered on 27-2-1992.

(e) Few instances of prime facie overcharging have come to the notice of this Department which are being examined to find out the real facts.

Weighted average of major producers of drugs

1945. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU:

SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 3762 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 26th March, 1992 and state:

(a) what are the names of tha bulk drugs prices of which have been fixed during 1991-92 on the basis of the unit as two third cut off level instead of on the basis of weighted average of major units;

(b) what is the price fixed for each drug and what is the difference between the price on the basis of 2/3rd level and on the basis of weighted average of major producers;

(c) what was the percentage of increase earlier price and revised price in each cases; and

(d) what were the earlier, revised and percentage of increase in the prices of the corresponding ceiling packs of formulations and on what net price of the bulk drug were these ceiling prices based?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (c) The prices of bulk drugs are fixed/revised by this Ministry on the basis of cost-cum-technical studies conducted by BICP and their detailed examination in the Ministry in accordance with the provisions laid down under DPCO 1987. BICP is an expert body of the Government on this matter. The price fixation takes into account of the actual cost of production of the major part of the production of the bulk drug in the country and price is fixed so that availability is ensured Revision fixation of prices is a normal part of price control and prices so fixed are notified in the official Gazette.

(d) The prices of ceiling packs of formulations are based on the prices of bulk drugs notified on the above basis.

Liability of M/s. Pfizer

1946. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU:

SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what is the liability of M/s. Pfizer to pay into the Drug Prices Equilisation Account in respect of various drugs;

(b) whether it is a fact that its liability has not been determined so far as they are taking care of the Officer on Special Duty;

(c) whether it is a fact that this officer and the Development Commissioner (PI) are on the Pay rolls of this company; and

(d) whether it is a fact that both the officers are busy in granting hearings to the companies without producing any results?